



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,218	02/26/2007	Christine Power	ARS-128	7710
23557	7590	10/17/2007	EXAMINER	
SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			LOCKARD, JON MCCLELLAND	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1647		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/583,218	POWER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jon M. Lockard	1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 40-59 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 40-59 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Sequence Alignment</u> .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 40-45 and 49-50, in so far as they are drawn to polypeptides, and kits and compositions comprising the same.

Group II, claim(s) 40, 45-46, and 49-54, in so far as they are drawn to polynucleotides, vectors and host cells comprising the same, and compositions and kits comprising the same.

Group III, claim(s) 40 and 45, in so far as they are drawn to transgenic organisms.

Group IV, claim(s) 40, 45, 47-48, and 50, in so far as they are drawn to antibodies, and compositions and kits comprising the same.

Group V, claim(s) 55-58, drawn to methods of treatment comprising administering a polypeptide.

Group VI, claim(s) 59, in so far as it is drawn to a screening method utilizing a polypeptide.

Group VII, claim(s) 59, in so far as it is drawn to a screening method utilizing a polynucleotide.

Group VIII, claim(s) 59, in so far as it is drawn to a screening method utilizing an antibody.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-VIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Group I is directed to a polypeptide comprising an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:4. However, since Garfinkel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,849,536, published 15 December 1998) teach a polypeptide set forth as SEQ ID NO:2 that comprises *an* amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:4 (for example, the polypeptide taught by Garfinkel et al. comprises amino acids 69-72 of SEQ ID NO:4; see attached sequence alignment), no special technical feature exists for group I as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, because

Art Unit: 1647

it does not define a contribution over the prior art. It is noted that the recitation of “*an* amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:4” has been interpreted to mean a partial sequence comprising as few as 2 amino acid residues of SEQ ID NO:4. Because the technical feature of Group I is not a special technical feature, and because the technical features of the Groups II-VIII inventions is not present in the Group I claims, unity of invention is lacking. Furthermore, the polypeptides of Group I, the polynucleotides of Group II, the transgenic organisms of Group III, and the antibodies of Group IV are structurally and functionally different chemical compounds, having different structures and activities, or in the case of the transgenic animals an organism, and each of which can be made and used without the other compounds. The methods of Groups V, VI, VII, and VIII require compounds which are functionally different from each other and each can be made and used without the other. Lack of unity is shown because these compounds lack a common utility which is based upon a common structural feature which has been identified as the basis for that common utility.

Election of Species

3. This application (*Group V*) contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

(1) inflammatory disease, (2) autoimmune disease, (3) immune disease, (4) infection, (5) allergic disease, (6) cardiovascular disease, (7) metabolic disease, (8) gastrointestinal disease, (9) neurological disease, (10) sepsis, (11) disease related to transplant rejection, (12) fibrotic disease, and (13) blood-feeding ectoparasite

4. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit: 1647

5. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

6. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species 1: Claim 56

Species 2: Claim 56

Species 3: Claim 56

Species 4: Claim 56

Species 5: Claim 56

Species 6: Claim 56

Species 7: Claim 56

Species 8: Claim 56

Species 9: Claim 56

Species 10: Claim 56

Species 11: Claim 56

Species 12: Claim 56

Species 13: Claim 56

The following claim(s) are generic: 55 and 57.

7. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: they are distinct medical conditions having different etiologies and effects, and therefore cannot constitute a unifying technical feature.

8. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Art Unit: 1647

9. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

10. **Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

11. The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to

Art Unit: 1647

petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

12. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

13. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

14. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Advisory Information

Effective November 1, 2007, if applicant wishes to present more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims in an application, applicant will be required to file an examination support document (ESD) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 before the first Office action on the merits (hereafter “5/25 claim threshold”). See Changes to Practice for Continued Examination Filings, Patent Applications Containing Patentably Indistinct Claims, and Examination of Claims in Patent Applications, 72 Fed. Reg. 46715 (Aug. 21, 2007), 1322 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 76 (Sept. 11, 2007) (final rule). The changes to 37 CFR 1.75(b) apply to any pending applications in which a first Office action on the merits (FAOM) has not been mailed before November 1, 2007. Withdrawn claims will not be taken into account in determining whether an application exceeds the 5/25 claim threshold. For more information on the final rule, please see <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/presentation/clmcontfinalrule.html>.

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in this Office action, applicant is required to file an election responsive to the restriction requirement. Applicant may not file a suggested restriction requirement (SRR) in lieu of an election responsive to the restriction requirement as a reply. A SRR alone will not be considered a *bona-fide* reply to this Office action.

If applicant elects an invention that is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims, applicant will not be required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims. If the elected invention is drawn to more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims, applicant may file an amendment canceling a number of elected claims so that the elected invention would be drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims.

If the restriction requirement is mailed on or after November 1, 2007, applicant is also required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims, unless the elected invention is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims. To avoid the abandonment of the application, the ESD (if required) and the election must be filed within **TWO MONTHS** from

Art Unit: 1647

the mailing date of this Office action. The two-month time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136.

If the restriction requirement is mailed before November 1, 2007, the election must be filed within **ONE MONTH** or **THIRTY DAYS**, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this Office action. The time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136. Furthermore, if the elected invention is drawn to more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims, the Office will notify applicant and provide a time period in which applicant is required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 covering each of the elected claims or amend the application to contain no more than 5 independent elected claims and no more than 25 total elected claims.

Art Unit: 1647

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jon M. Lockard** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2717**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Manjunath N. Rao**, can be reached on **(571) 272-0939**.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).



Jon M. Lockard, Ph.D.
October 5, 2007

Sequence Alignment

ALIGNMENTS

RESULT 1
 US-08-347-594A-2
 ; Sequence 2, Application US/08347594A
 ; Patent No. 5849536
 ; GENERAL INFORMATION:
 ; APPLICANT: Garfinkel, Leonard
 ; APPLICANT: Richter, Tamar
 ; TITLE OF INVENTION: CLONING AND PRODUCTION OF HUMAN VON
 ; TITLE OF INVENTION: WILLEBRAND FACTOR GPIb BINDING DOMAIN POLYPEPTIDES
 AND
 ; TITLE OF INVENTION: METHODS OF USING SAME
 ; NUMBER OF SEQUENCES: 4
 ; CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
 ; ADDRESSEE: John P. White
 ; STREET: 1185 Avenue of the Americas
 ; CITY: New York
 ; STATE: New York
 ; COUNTRY: USA
 ; ZIP: 10036
 ; COMPUTER READABLE FORM:
 ; MEDIUM TYPE: Floppy disk
 ; COMPUTER: IBM PC compatible
 ; OPERATING SYSTEM: PC-DOS/MS-DOS
 ; SOFTWARE: PatentIn Release #1.0, Version #1.25
 ; CURRENT APPLICATION DATA:
 ; APPLICATION NUMBER: US/08/347,594A
 ; FILING DATE: No. 5849536ember 30, 1994
 ; CLASSIFICATION: 435
 ; ATTORNEY/AGENT INFORMATION:
 ; NAME: White, John P.
 ; REGISTRATION NUMBER: 28,678
 ; REFERENCE/DOCKET NUMBER: 36537-B2
 ; TELECOMMUNICATION INFORMATION:
 ; TELEPHONE: 212-278-0400
 ; TELEFAX: 212-391-0525
 ; TELEX:
 ; INFORMATION FOR SEQ ID NO: 2:
 ; SEQUENCE CHARACTERISTICS:
 ; LENGTH: 2050 amino acids
 ; TYPE: amino acid
 ; TOPOLOGY: linear
 ; MOLECULE TYPE: protein
 US-08-347-594A-2

Query Match 13.7%; Score 84; DB 1; Length 2050;
 Best Local Similarity 29.1%; Pred. No. 7.3;
 Matches 25; Conservative 9; Mismatches 26; Indels 26; Gaps 5;

Qy 40 CVFERNV-----IPDGETKALNSPCVISTCYAADRKVNSTL-----CPNFGVAEG 84
 !: | | :|| :|| | || : |||| | | : |
 Db 1494 CIGEDGVHQFLEAWVPD-----HQPCQICTCLSG-RKVNCCTQPCPTAKAPTCGLCEV 1546

Qy 85 CHVEWTPDGEYPNCCPKHVCPTAPVT 110
 : | || :| || :|
 Db 1547 ARLRQNAD---QCCPEYECVCDPVS 1568